PB-244 933

IMPACT OF THE FUEL SHORTAGE ON PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION. VOLUME 1. A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF NATIONAL OPINION ABOUT ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEMS AND THEIR SOLUTION

Joseph M. Viladas Company

Prepared for:

Environmental Protection Agency

June 1975

DISTRIBUTED BY:

NTIS

National Technical Information Service
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

267010

PB 244 933

REPORT

IMPACT OF THE FUEL SHORTAGE ON PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

A Follow-up Survey of National Opinion about Environmental Problems and their Solution

For the United States Environmental Protection Agency

Volume 1

Reproduced by
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
US Department of Commerce
Springfield, VA. 22151

June 1974

June 28, 1974

Mr. Charles M. Rogers
Director Communications
Services Division
Office of Public Affairs
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington, D. C. 20460

Dear Mr. Rogers:

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with your Agency.

The data presented in this study were obtained through interviews with a sample of men and women according to a plan explained in the attached report. The interpretation of the data and the conclusions presented are our own.

We hope this study will contribute to a greater understanding of public attitudes about the environment, particularly with regard to issues affected by events generally referred to as the energy crisis.

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Viladas

JMV:lll

Enclosure

1D

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. EPA-MISC	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle Impact of the fuel shortage on public attitude toward environmental protection, Vol 1			5. Report Date June 1974.
			6.
7. Author(s)			8. Performing Organization Rept. No.
9. Performing Organization Name and Address J.M. Viladas, Division of de Kadt Marketing & Research, Inc. 12 Havemeyer Place Greenwich, Conn. 06830			10. Project/Task/Work Unit No. 11. Contract/Grant No.
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 401 M St., S.W. Washington, D.C. 20460			13. Type of Report & Period Covered 14.

15. Supplementary Notes

16. Abstracts

The study deals with people's attitudes about relaxing environmental protection as a means of helping the U.S. cope with the fuel shortage. The data were gathered in May 1974.

17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors

* fuel
* Shortages
* Public opinion

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

* Environmental protection.

17c. COSATI Field/Group

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Release Unlimited	UNCLASSIFIED	57
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price 4.25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
HIGHLIGHTS	i
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Why This Study Was Done	1
Scope of This Study	3
How This Study Was Done	4
How the Sample Was Selected	5
Data Tables	6
II. PERCEIVED CHANGES IN FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION	7
Changes in Feelings by Demographic Characteristics	8
Changes in Feelings by Attitudes Expressed One Year Ago	10
Change in Feelings by Awareness of EPA	12
Summary	13
III. PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT WAYS OF EASING THE FUEL SHORTAGE	15
Questions Asked About Ways of Easing the Fuel Shortage	15
Ratings of Ways to Ease the Fuel Shortage	17
Summary	22
IV. PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD RELAXING ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	23
Questions Asked	23
Percentage of People For and Against Relaxing Environmental Protection	24
Usefulness and Favorability	26
Population Area Differences	28
Summary	30

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

V. INFLUENCE OF THE FUEL SHORTAGE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION..... 32

Questions Asked About the Influence of the Fuel Crisis..... 32
How Affected People Felt..... 33
Relationship Between Reaction to Fuel Shortage and Changes in Feelings About Fighting Pollution..... 33
Influence of the Fuel Shortage on the Perceived Usefulness of Steps to Ease that Shortage..... 34
Influence of the Fuel Shortage on Attitude For or Against Various Ways of Easing that Shortage..... 37
Summary..... 38

QUESTIONNAIRE

HIGHLIGHTS

This study deals with people's attitudes about relaxing environmental protection as a means of helping this country cope with the fuel shortage. This study was performed under a contract with the Environmental Protection Agency.

The data for this study was gathered in May of this year through 500 telephone interviews with a representative subsample of the 3,012 adults interviewed one year ago in the course of a larger study of public opinion and attitudes about environmental issues.

The current stucy complements the earlier one entitled "The American People and Their Environment -- 1973". That study showed widespread concern about damage to the environment, a sense of impatience about the progress made in environmental protection, and considerable willingness to pay for a better environment. The energy crisis raised new questions about the state of public opinion and attitudes. The study presented here attempts to answer some of those questions.

Chapter I is an introduction to the report and explains its purpose, methodology and scope.

Scope of this Study

This study attempts to answer the following questions:

- How many people feel more or less in favor of fighting pollution now than they did one year ago?
- Do people feel that relaxing environmental protection would help ease the fuel shortage?
- How many people are for or against relaxing environmental protection, particularly in the area of air quality?
- Are attitudes toward relaxing environmental protection related to how affected people were by the fuel shortage?

Answers to these questions have been cross-tabulated by attitudes measured one year ago. In this manner, the current state of public opinion and attitudes can be seen in the perspective of opinions and attitudes preceding the critical phase of the fuel shortage.

Perceived Changes in Feelings about Fighting Pollution

Chapter II deals with the answers people gave to the following question:

> "Compared to last spring, are you now more in favor of fighting pollution, less in favor of fighting pollution or do you feel about the same as you did a year ago about fighting pollution?"

Most people say that their feelings about fighting pollution are about the same as a year ago (78%) or that they are now more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago (18%); very few people (3%) say that they are now less in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago.

While public opinion polls have indicated that pollution is not as prominent an issue as it was a year ago, this survey suggests that those polls should not be taken to mean that people care less about pollution control now than they did before the fuel crisis; although other issues have captured greater public attention, the concern about pollution continues to grow.

The percentage of people who are now more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago is higher in metropolitan areas with a population of one million or more (23% "more in favor") than in smaller metropolitan areas (15%) and in non-metropolitan areas (14%).

Relating these figures to the answers people gave last year, we find that 23 percent of the people who last year expressed a high level of concern about environmental damage are now more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago; only 12 percent of those who last year expressed a low level of concern about environmental damage are now more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago.

This explains why in larger metropolitan areas, where concern about pollution is highest, the percentage of people who are more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago is greater than in other areas.

Public Opinion About Ways of Easing the Fuel Shortage

Chapter III looks at a variety of steps suggested or implemented in order to ease the fuel shortage and shows how useful these steps are thought to be by the American people. Some of these steps involve a relaxation of environmental protection; others do not. The analysis reveals people's preferences between those two approaches to easing the fuel shortage.

People were asked the following question:

> "Now I'm going to read a list of things that have been suggested to cope with the fuel shortage. Some people think these things can help ease the shortage, others think they won't help.
>
> Now, in your opinion, would you say that [item mentioned] can help a lot, some but not a lot, only a little or not at all?"

The last part of the question was repeated for each of the eighteen items or steps listed below.

The figure next to each item shows the percentage of people who said it can help ease the fuel shortage "a lot" or "some but not a lot". These figures are generally an approximate measure of popularity.

	A Lot/ Some %
Improving public transportation	84
Lowering the speed limits on highways	
Driving smaller cars	71
Building the Alaskan pipeline	68
Keeping the temperature at home less comfortable	66
Cutting down the number of airplane flights	56
Building more atomic energy plants	54
*Taking antipollution devices out of cars	49
*Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	46
Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays	44
Increasing coal production through strip mining	41
*Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	41
*Relaxing pollution controls for factories	38
Rationing gasoline	38
Having daylight saving time all year round	35
Removing price controls from oil and gas	32
Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption	28
*Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	22

Of the eighteen steps people were asked to rate, five represent various ways of relaxing or suspending federal environmental quality standards. These five steps are identified with an asterisk here in order to make it easier to see their position in relation to others.

There are seven steps which a majority of people say can help ease the fuel shortage "a lot" or "some"; none of these involve a relaxation of federal

environmental quality standards, instead they are ways of reducing fuel consumption or increasing the supply of energy.

Three ways of reducing fuel consumption, namely improving public transportation, lowering the speed limits on highways and driving smaller cars were found to be the most popular steps. They are most popular not only in metropolitan areas but also in non-metropolitan areas, which is remarkable in view of earlier findings showing that public transportation enjoyed far less support in non-metropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas.

Two other steps intended to reduce fuel consumption were also found to be very popular: keeping the temperature at home a little less comfortable and cutting down the number of airplane flights. On the other hand, rationing and fuel price increases are very unpopular solutions.

Of the three steps representing ways of increasing the supply of energy, building the Alaskan pipeline and building more atomic energy plants are perceived to be helpful by a majority of people; increasing coal production through strip mining is not.

The percentage of people who are not sure how helpful each of these eighteen steps would be is generally low, but when it comes to strip mining and atomic energy, 26 percent of the people say they are not sure how helpful they would be. These percentages are nearly identical to the percentages of people who last year said they were not sure how much damage strip min-

ing and atomic power plants do to the environment and reveal a comparatively low level of public involvement in these issues.

Public Attitudes Toward Relaxing Environmental Protection

Chapter IV shows how many people are for or against various ways of easing the fuel shortage. It also shows that opinions about the usefulness of solutions to the fuel shortage are a fair measure of how favorable people are to those solutions.

People were asked the following question:

> "I'm going to name a few of the things that have been suggested to help cope with the fuel shortage. For each one I name, please tell me whether you are for or against it."
>
> "Are you for or against [item named]?"

The last part of the questions was repeated for each of the seven items listed below. The percentages of people "for", "against" or "not sure" are also shown for each item.

	For	Against	Not Sure
	%	%	%
Driving smaller cars	71	19	9
Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	46	41	13
Increasing coal production through strip mining	42	34	24
Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	42	45	13
Taking antipollution devices out of cars	41	49	10
Relaxing pollution controls for factories	31	59	10
Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	12	81	6

Only one item, driving smaller cars, receives the support of a majority of the American people. Two items that are not favored by an absolute majority do, nevertheless, enjoy the support of a majority of the people who have an opinion about them. These items are: relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles (which has been done) and increasing coal production through strip mining (which Congress is now debating). The remaining four items are not favored by a majority even if the people who have no opinion are excluded from the calculation. One item, letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air, is opposed by 81 percent of the people.

A comparison of these percentages with those of people who rated these seven items as capable of helping "a lot" or "some" to ease the fuel shortage shows the two sets of figures to be very similar except for letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air, relaxing pollution controls for factories and taking antipollution devices out of cars. The percentages of people who are in favor of taking these three steps are lower than the percentages of people who feel these steps would help ease the fuel shortage.

Influence of the Fuel Shortage on Attitudes Toward Environmental Protection

Chapter V deals with the following question: Are people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage more disposed to relaxing federal environmental quality standards than people who felt less affected by the fuel shortage?

As mentioned above, most people feel that they are now as much or more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago. There is no difference in this feeling regardless of how affected people have been by the fuel shortage.

The extent to which people felt affected by the fuel shortage influences their views on what to do about it, but the majority of people oppose solutions involving a relaxation of federal environmental quality standards, regardless of how affected they were by the fuel shortage.

When it comes to cutting down the number of airplane flights, building more atomic energy plants, driving smaller cars and improving public transportation, people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage are also more likely to favor taking these steps in order to alleviate the fuel shortage. Support for closing gasoline stations on Sunday, rationing gasoline and increasing coal production through strip mining is at a lower level but follows the same pattern.

By contrast, when it comes to taking antipollution devices out of cars, letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage, relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles, relaxing pollution controls for factories and letting air pollution increase in areas that now have

clean air, people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage are no more likely to favor these steps than people who felt less affected by the fuel shortage.

Conclusion

The fuel shortage has not diminished the American people's desire to eliminate pollution. People believe that reducing fuel consumption and increasing the supply of energy are more helpful than relaxing federal environmental quality standards any further. In stating this belief, people express a preference for keeping up the fight against pollution in spite of the fuel shortage and regardless of how that shortage affected them. The majority of people are not in favor of measures that could ease the fuel shortage at the cost of increasing air pollution.

I. INTRODUCTION

A study entitled "The American People and Their Environment -- 1973", performed under contract with the Environmental Protection Agency, was submitted to that Agency on November 2, 1973. That study was based on an analysis of extensive interviews conducted in May and June 1973 with a national probability sample of 3,012 men and women.

When a serious fuel shortage developed soon after the release of that study, questions were raised about the impact of the shortage on public attitudes toward environmental protection.

Why This Study Was Done

The 1973 study revealed a broad public consensus that air pollution, water pollution, and solid waste are big problems. Generally, people were optimistic about solving these problems but impatient with the progress made in solving them.

Measured in terms of perceived damage to the environment, air pollution was found to be the most widespread concern; more specifically, motor vehicle exhaust and industrial emissions ranked at the top of a twenty-item list of alleged sources of environmental damage. Concern about untreated sewage, industrial effluents and solid waste followed closely.

Public concern about air pollution was backed up by a willingness to pay for cleaner air. Fifty-eight percent of car owners reacted favor-

ably to an increase of $150 per car to pay for antipollution devices; it was estimated that, at 1973 prices, a majority of car owners would support an increase of as much as $250 per car for that purpose.

To meet the cost of air pollution control at electric power generating plants, people volunteered to pay an increase of 22 percent in their monthly bill.

Concerning enforcement of antipollution measures, it was found that people leaned toward strict enforcement, but no clear majority emerged on either side of the choice between strict and permissive enforcement in pollution abatement.

It was inferred that people approach the enforcement issue pragmatically; when faced with the facts, they balance the cost of pollution abatement and its benefits and then take a stand.

Against this background, the energy crisis posed a number of questions about people's willingness to support progressively stricter environmental standards. On the one hand, the widespread concern about pollution and the serious commitment to a better environment expressed earlier in 1973 argued against expecting a drastic change in public attitudes toward environmental protection. On the other hand, the seriousness of the fuel shortage and its tangible impact on vast numbers of people made it plausible to expect the American public to

favor a relaxation of environmental protection. Clearly the state of public opinion could not be ascertained without further study.

The overall objective of the study presented here is to enable the Environmental Protection Agency to act in close coordination with the American people by providing the Agency with current information about people's attitudes toward environmental protection issues that are related to the energy crisis.

The Scope of This Study

The scope of this survey is limited to the following objectives:

- Determine whether people feel that their attitudes toward environmental protection have changed since last year.
- Measure to what extent people favor a relaxation of environmental protection in order to alleviate the fuel shortage.
- Learn whether people's stand for or against relaxing environmental protection is related to how affected they were personally by the fuel shortage.
- Relate these findings to those obtained in 1973.

In order to achieve these objectives at low cost, it was decided to reinterview by telephone 500 of the 3,012 people interviewed in person last June.

How This Study Was Done

The data obtained from the 3,012 adults interviewed in June 1973 constitutes a valuable resource of information about attitudes toward environmental issues. By systematically selecting 500 of the 3,012 adults interviewed last year, it was possible to obtain a representative subsample whose opinions and attitudes preceding the energy crisis were known. This subsample provided the basis for relating current attitudes to those existing before the energy crisis.

The interview covered four topics:

- Whether people now feel more or less in favor of fighting pollution than they did a year ago.
- How affected people feel, personally, by the fuel shortage.
- Rating of eighteen remedies on their ability to help ease the fuel shortage. The list of remedies includes some that are immediately related to environmental standards, such as relaxing pollution controls for factories, and some that are not related to those standards, such as letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption. Both types of remedies were included in order to position people's responses in a realistic context of options experienced or widely discussed during the most critical phase of the fuel shortage.
- Whether the people are for or against relaxing environmental protection as a means of easing the fuel shortage.

Each person interviewed was asked a total of twenty-seven questions. The answers to these questions have been tabulated against the person's demographic characteristics and against attitudes expressed last June.

How the Sample Was Selected

The June 1973 study was based on a national probability sample of 430 clusters in 102 primary sampling units (PSU) selected disproportionately in order to complete a minimum of 200 interviews in each of the ten Federal Regions. Approximately seven interviews were completed in each cluster. The 3,012 completed interviews were weighted to represent the continental United States as a whole and in terms of demographic composition by sex, age, area size and the nine Census Regions.

For this study, the 430 clusters were arrayed numerically by the first two digits of the cluster code; the first digit identifies the Census Region and the second digit denotes area size. Using a random starting point, every sixth respondent was identified to be recontacted. If the person identified in a cluster could not be recontacted (e.g. moved and new telephone number not available, deceased, etc.), another respondent was selected as a substitute in the same cluster, preferably one of the same sex.

In tabulating the interviews for this study, we used the statistical weights applied to the June 1973 data.

How the Interview Was Conducted

Interviews were done by telephone on WATS lines with trained interviewers under continuing supervision at a central facility. The questionnaire used for the interviews will be found at the end of this report.

Data Tables

Data summaries are included in the body of this report. Complete data tables will be found in Volume II.

II. PERCEIVED CHANGES IN FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION

The first question raised by the energy crisis is how many people changed their feelings about fighting pollution. This question could have been answered by asking people the same questions asked one year ago but this method was ruled out as too costly in the present circumstances. For this reason it was decided to ask people whether or not their feelings had changed. The answers do not necessarily reveal whether people's feelings have actually changed; they do show whether people feel they are now more or less in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago.

Question Asked About Changes in Feelings

People were asked the following question:

> "Compared to last spring, are you now more in favor of fighting pollution, less in favor of fighting pollution or do you feel about the same as you did a year ago about fighting pollution?"

Changes in Feelings by Total Sample

With rare exceptions, people say that their feelings about fighting pollution are about the same as a year ago or even stronger. As shown in Table II-1, 78 percent of the people interviewed state that their feelings are "about the same" as they were last spring; 18 percent say they are "more in favor" of fighting pollution; and 3 percent say they are "less in favor" than last spring.

TABLE II-1

CURRENT FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION
COMPARED TO SPRING 1973

BASE	Total Sample (496)
	%
More in favor	18
Less in favor	3
About the same	78
No answer	1

Changes in Feelings by Demographic Characteristics

The relatively small size of the sample interviewed makes it likely that some of the differences observed between demographic groups are the result of sampling fluctuations. Nevertheless, some of the patterns suggested by the data are worth mentioning. The percentages in Table II-2 are to be read across.

It appears that concern about pollution abatement continues to rise faster in large metropolitan areas than elsewhere. Of the people who live in areas with a population of one million or more, 23 percent say they are more in favor of fighting pollution now than they were one year ago; in other areas that percentage is smaller (14% to 15%).

The college educated are more likely to express growing concern than the non-college educated (23% vs. 15%). Occupation, which is correlated with education, suggests that concern among the white collar is growing faster than among the blue collar.

The percentage of people who are less in favor of fighting pollution is very small for all demographic groups.

TABLE II-2

HOW FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION HAVE CHANGED DURING THE PAST YEAR BY DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	More in Favor	Less in Favor	About the Same
	%	%	%
Total Sample	18	3	78
Age:			
18 - 34	18	5	76
35 and over	18	2	79
Education:			
College	23	5	72
No college	15	2	81
Occupation of Household Head:			
White Collar	23	3	73
Blue collar; farm	14	4	82
Not gainfully employed	19	1	78
Household Income:			
Under $3,000	8	-	89
$3,000 - $6,999	22	2	76
$7,000 - $14,999	18	3	79
$15,000 and over	18	5	76
Area Type and Size:			
Metropolitan, 1MM and over	23	3	73
Metropolitan, 50M - 1MM	15	2	81
Non-metropolitan	14	5	81

NOTE: Read percentages across.

Changes in Feelings by Attitudes Expressed One Year Ago

People's views about change in their feelings toward fighting pollution are related here to the attitudes people expressed last Spring. The data are shown in Table II-3. The percentages are to be read across.

In the Spring of 1973 it was found that 43 percent of adults chose pollution control as one of the most important issues of the day. Comparable measures obtained by public opinion polls since that time show that pollution is a less prominent issue today than it was a year ago; inflation and Watergate have become the prominent issues of today. It would be wrong to infer from this that people are no longer interested in pollution control. On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of people either say that they are just as much in favor of pollution control now as they were a year ago or they say that they are more in favor of pollution control now than a year ago. This is true whether or not they mentioned pollution control as one of the most important issues of the day in the Spring of 1973.

Another measure used a year ago was the quality rating of people's environment. It was found that 30 percent of the people rated their environment "excellent" or "very good", 34 percent rated it "good", and 34 percent rated it "fair", "poor" or "very poor". We now find nearly identical feelings about change in concern about fighting pollution regardless of how people rated their environment a year ago.

A third measure used last year was environmental concern, which was summarized in terms of relative environmental damage scores. We now find that people who last Spring expressed a high level of concern about environmental damage are now much more likely to say that they are more in favor of fighting pollution than people who expressed a low level of concern. This reveals a continuing concern and accounts for the differences found between large metropolitan areas and other areas. The passage of time and the emergence of other important issues has not diminished people's concern about their environment, in fact that concern seems to have increased everywhere, but more so in the most populated areas which are generally the most polluted.

Finally, people's feelings about being more or less in favor of fighting pollution can be related to their overall willingness to pay for improving the environment as measured in the spring of 1973. Table II-3 shows two groups, namely those who had volunteered to pay nothing and those who had volunteered to pay at least a minimal amount. As explained in last year's report, the amounts volunteered cannot be taken literally, but they do rank people by their relative willingness to pay for pollution abatement. It is now found that the percentage of people who say that they are more in favor of fighting pollution is higher among those who were more willing to pay for it than among those less willing to pay; yet, even among the latter we find 14 percent who say they are now more in favor of fighting pollution than they were a year ago and only one percent who are less in favor of it.

TABLE II-3

HOW FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION HAVE CHANGED DURING PAST YEAR BY ATTITUDES EXPRESSED ONE YEAR AGO

	More in Favor %	Less in Favor %	About the Same %
Total Sample	18	3	78
Importance of Pollution Control:			
Very important	21	3	76
Not very important	16	3	79
Rating of Environment:			
Excellent, very good	17	5	77
Good	19	2	79
Fair, poor, very poor	18	3	78
Environmental Concern:			
High	23	1	75
Medium	20	2	76
Low	12	6	82
Amount Volunteered to Pay:			
Nothing	14	1	85
$1 or more	20	4	76

NOTE: Read percentages across.

Change in Feelings by Awareness of EPA

Last year it was found that 58 percent of the American public were aware of the Environmental Protection Agency. These people were more likely to be personally involved in fighting pollution, more likely

to have made their minds up about environmental issues and more willing to pay the cost of a cleaner environment than people who were not aware of EPA.

As shown in Table II-4, we find that people who were aware of EPA last spring are not very different from the rest with respect to changes in feelings about fighting pollution. The percentage who are more in favor of fighting pollution now than a year ago is 20 percent among the aware and 16 percent among the not aware.

TABLE II-4

HOW FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION HAVE CHANGED DURING PAST YEAR BY AWARENESS OF EPA

Awareness of EPA, Spring 1873	More in Favor %	Less in Favor %	About the Same %
Aware	20	3	76
Not aware	16	3	80

Summary

When asked whether their feelings about fighting pollution have changed since the spring of 1973, most people (78%) say they are now as much in favor of fighting pollution as they were a year ago, a significant minority (18%) now feel more in favor of fighting pollution, and only a few (3%) feel less in favor of fighting pollution than they did a year ago.

These data suggest that concern about fighting pollution is growing, particularly so in large metropolitan areas with a population of one million or more.

While public opinion polls have indicated that pollution is not as prominent an issue as it was a year ago, this survey suggests that this should not be taken to mean that people care less about pollution control than they did then; on the contrary, although other issues have captured public attention, the concern about pollution continues to grow.

People are as much in favor of fighting pollution as a year ago, or more in favor of it, regardless of the quality of their environment as rated a year ago.

We also find that the greater the concern about environmental damage, the greater the likelihood of being more in favor of fighting pollution. This explains why more people in larger metropolitan areas say they are now more in favor of fighting pollution.

The greater the willingness to pay for a better environment expressed a year ago, the greater the likelihood of being more in favor of fighting pollution now than a year ago.

The passage of time and the emergence of other issues has not diminished people's concern about their environment. On the contrary, that concern seems to have increased during the last twelve months.

III. PUBLIC OPINION ABOUT WAYS OF EASING THE FUEL SHORTAGE

As the fuel crisis became critical, a great many people were affected by it. Their personal experiences, together with a daily stream of news about events, legislation, executive decisions, proposals, plans and ideas, must have shaped public opinion about means of easing the shortage.

Some of the actions taken and some of the ideas advanced to cope with the fuel shortage involved a relaxation of environmental protection. Others did not. While our concern in this study is with the former, public opinion is examined in the context of a broad range of options so that the perceived usefulness of relaxing environmental protection can be compared with the perceived usefulness of other steps or ideas.

Questions Asked About Ways of Easing the Fuel Shortage

People were asked to rate eighteen items according to their opinion on how helpful each item is in easing the fuel shortage. The question was asked as follows:

> "Now I'm going to read a list of things that have been suggested to cope with the fuel shortage. Some people think these things can help ease the shortage, others think they won't help. Now, in your opinion, would you say that [item mentioned] can help a lot, some but not a lot, only a little or not at all?"

The question was asked for each item, one at a time and the sequence of items was rotated to minimize position bias.

Of the eighteen items rated, six have an immediate and direct bearing on environmental quality standards:

- Taking antipollution devices out of cars
- Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage
- Relaxing pollution controls for factories
- Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air
- Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles

Eleven items represent a variety of steps and proposals not necessarily related to environmental quality standards:

- Cutting down the number of airplane flights
- Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption
- Rationing gasoline
- Closing down gasoline stations on Sundays
- Driving smaller cars
- Lowering the speed limits on highways
- Building more atomic energy plants
- Having daylight saving time all year round
- Removing price controls from oil and gas
- Improving public transportation
- Keeping the temperature at home a little less comfortable

The remaining two items are:

- Building the Alaskan pipeline (settled by Congress before this survey)
- Increasing coal production through strip mining (no federal quality standards in effect)

Ratings of Ways to Ease the Fuel Shortage

The frequency with which each item was rated as helping "a lot", "some but not a lot", "only a little" or "not at all" to ease the fuel shortage is shown in Tables 3 through 20 in Volume II. In order to simplify the presentation, Table III-1 shows the sum of "a lot" and "some but not a lot", the sum of "only a little" and "not at all" and the "not sure, don't know" responses. Thus, each line adds up to 100 percent of the people surveyed.

The eighteen items are listed from highest to lowest frequency of combined "a lot" and "some but not a lot" ratings. Items immediately and directly related to federal environmental quality standards are identified with an asterisk in order to make it easier to find them.

In the next chapter we will show how many people are for or against each of the items marked with an asterisk. Generally, the relative perceived usefulness of each item in easing the fuel shortage reflects the relative favor or disfavor the item finds among the public. Thus, while in this chapter we will discuss public attitudes toward the perceived usefulness of steps taken or suggested to ease the fuel

shortage, the reader should keep in mind that these attitudes reflect rather well the extent to which people are for or against those steps.

As shown in Table III-1, of the eighteen items rated by their helpfulness in easing the fuel shortage, seven are rated "a lot" or "some but not a lot" by a majority of the people interviewed. These items are:

Improving public transportation (84%)
Lowering the speed limits on highways (78%)
Driving smaller cars (71%)
Building the Alaskan pipeline (68%)
Keeping the temperature at home a little less comfortable (66%)
Cutting down the number of airplane flights (56%)
Building more atomic energy plants (54%)

None of the items that involve a relaxation of federal environmental quality standards are ranked among the top seven and, as we will show in the next chapter, not one of them enjoys majority support. Of the seven items that are most popular, five describe various ways of using less energy and two describe ways of increasing the supply of energy.

As shown in Table III-2, these seven items rate high in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. Improving public transportation, the leading item on the list, is rated "a lot" or "some" by 89 percent of the people in metropolitan areas with a population of one million or more, by 84 percent of the people in metropolitan areas with less than a million, and by a remarkable 77 percent of the people living in non-metropolitan areas. The last percentage is remarkable in view

of earlier findings showing that public transportation enjoyed far less support in non-metropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas.

Of the eleven items not rated by a majority as capable of helping "a lot" or "some" to ease the fuel shortage, five are related to environmental quality standards and will be discussed in the next chapter. Six do not involve federal environmental quality standards; these items and the frequencies with which they are rated "a lot" and "some" are:

Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays (44%)
Increasing coal production through strip mining (41%)
Rationing gasoline (38%)
Having daylight saving time all year round (35%)
Removing price controls from oil and gas (32%)
Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption (28%)

The last four items rate lower than the ones involving environmental quality standards except for letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air which ranks last on the whole list.

Two items stand out because of the uncertainty of public opinion, namely the use of atomic energy and the merits of strip mining. Last year we found that about 29 percent of the people were not sure how much damage these activities do to the environment. Current ratings of their usefulness in easing the fuel shortage show that 26 percent of the people interviewed have not formed an opinion. The two views are probably related.

TABLE III-1

RATING OF ITEMS ON THEIR PERCEIVED USEFULNESS
IN EASING THE FUEL SHORTAGE

	A Lot/ Some	Only a Little/ Not at All	Not Sure, Don't Know
	%	%	%
Improving public transportation	84	12	4
Lowering the speed limits on highways	78	20	2
Driving smaller cars	71	35	4
Building the Alaskan pipeline	68	14	18
Keeping the temperature at home less comfortable	66	31	3
Cutting down the number of airplane flights	56	34	10
Building more atomic energy plants	54	20	26
*Taking antipollution devices out of cars	49	39	12
*Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	46	39	15
Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays	44	52	4
Increasing coal production through strip mining	41	33	26
*Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	41	42	17
*Relaxing pollution controls for factories	38	50	12
Rationing gasoline	38	57	5
Having daylight saving time all year round	35	60	5
Removing price controls from oil and gas	32	54	14
Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption	28	67	5
*Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	22	69	9

TABLE III-2

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AREAS IN THE FREQUENCY OF "A LOT" AND "SOME" USEFULNESS RATINGS

	Metropolitan Areas		Non-metropolitan Areas
	1,000,000 or More	50,000-1,000,000	
	%	%	%
Improving public transportation	89	84	77
Lowering the speed limits on highways	76	78	79
Driving smaller cars	67	74	72
Building the Alaskan pipeline	68	67	68
Keeping the temperature at home less comfortable	60	64	70
Cutting down the number of airplane flights	59	53	56
Building more atomic energy plants	56	54	50
*Taking antipollution devices out of cars	50	47	49
*Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	45	46	48
Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays	40	42	50
Increasing coal production through strip mining	39	39	46
*Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	38	44	42
*Relaxing pollution controls for factories	38	36	41
Rationing gasoline	35	35	47
Having daylight saving time all year round	37	37	30
Removing price controls from oil and gas	31	27	28
Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption	32	23	28
*Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	21	20	26

Summary

The purpose of the data discussed in this chapter is to place public opinion about relaxing environmental standards in the perspective of other means of coping with a fuel shortage.

Of eighteen items rated, the seven rated most useful do not involve a relaxation of environmental quality standards; instead, they represent ways of reducing fuel consumption and of increasing the supply of energy.

The most popular solutions are: improving public transportation, lowering speed limits, driving smaller cars, building the Alaskan pipeline, keeping the temperature at home less comfortable, cutting down the number of airplane flights and building more atomic energy plants. All of them appear to enjoy majority support in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

The use of atomic energy and the merits of strip mining continue to be characterized by considerable uncertainty; about one-fourth of the people have not formed an opinion about their usefulness in helping cope with the fuel shortage.

IV. PUBLIC ATTITUDES TOWARD RELAXING ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

In the preceding chapter we examined public opinion about means of easing the fuel shortage. Eighteen items were rated on their perceived ability to help ease the fuel shortage. In this chapter we will see how many people are for or against seven of the eighteen items discussed in the preceding chapter. The emphasis here will be on items that are related to the relaxation of environmental standards as a means of coping with the fuel shortage.

Questions Asked

The question was introduced as follows:

> "I'm going to name a few of the things that have been suggested to help cope with the fuel shortage. For each one I name, please tell me whether you are for or against it."

The following question was then repeated for each item:

> "Are you for or against [item named]?"

This question was asked about the following items:

- Taking antipollution devices out of cars
- Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage
- Increasing coal production through strip mining
- Relaxing pollution controls for factories
- Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air

- Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles
- Driving smaller cars

The wording is deliberately non-technical but it is readily apparent that most of these items are related to environmental quality standards.

Percentage of People For and Against Relaxing Environmental Protection

The percentages shown in Table IV-1 show that only one of the seven solutions whose public support was measured is favored by a large majority of the people and that solution is driving smaller cars. The other six, which involve a relaxation of environmental quality standards or have been advocated in terms of not too stringent environmental protection, are favored by a minority only, that is, less than 50 percent of the people.

One step which has already been taken, namely relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles, comes close to majority support (46 percent of the people interviewed are for it) and is favored by a majority of those who have an opinion about it. This survey was taken before it was announced that the catalytic afterburner will make a sizeable improvement in automobile performance possible; when that happens, public support for further postponement in the implementation of automotive emission standards is likely to decline.

Concerning the increase of coal production through strip mining, 42 percent of the people favor it, 34 percent oppose it and 24 percent are undecided. Again, this step is favored by a majority of the people who have an opinion about it. The high incidence of undecided people is a symptom of low public involvement in the issue. The study done last year showed a similar level of "no opinion" and other data from that study suggested that people with no opinion about strip mining have a comparatively low concern about environmental protection. It is reasonable to expect that once federal strip mining standards are promulgated, public opinion will support them.

The remaining four items are favored by a minority even if people with no opinion are excluded.

The burning of dirtier fuels at power-generating plants is favored by 42 percent of the people and opposed by 45 percent; the remaining 13 percent have no opinion on this issue.

A similar split of public opinion is found with respect to taking antipollution devices out of cars: 41 percent are for it, 49 percent are against it and 10 percent have no opinion.

Support for relaxing pollution controls for factories is even lower; only 31 percent of the people favor that solution and 59 percent oppose it.

TABLE IV-1

PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE FOR AND AGAINST SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS FOR COPING WITH FUEL SHORTAGE

	For %	Against %	Not Sure %
Driving smaller cars	71	19	9
Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	46	41	13
Increasing coal production through strip mining	42	34	24
Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	42	45	13
Taking antipollution devices out of cars	41	49	10
Relaxing pollution controls for factories	31	59	10
Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	12	81	6

Finally, letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air, which is meant to represent the so-called degradation standards, enjoys the least support (only 12 percent of the people are for it) and the highest opposition (81 percent of the people are against it). It is also the issue on which we find the lowest incidence of no opinion (6%).

Usefulness and Favorability

A comparison of the usefulness ratings presented in the preceding chapter and the favorability ratings discussed here reveals two valuable findings. First, the rating people give each item in terms of how useful they think it would be in coping with a fuel shortage is an approximate measure of comparative public support for the solutions

represented by the items included in this survey. This finding is supported by the comparison shown in Table IV-2.

Table IV-2 shows identical or very similar percentages for most of the items compared. In the case of driving smaller cars, for example, 71 percent of the people rated it "a lot" or "some" in usefulness and 71 percent are "for" driving smaller cars. This does not mean that everyone who said that driving smaller cars would help "a lot" or "some" to cope with the fuel crisis is also in favor of driving smaller cars; it means that the majority are in favor of it and that even many of the people who think driving small cars would help only "a little" are in favor of doing it.

It is also readily noticeable that the ranking of the seven items by their frequency of usefulness ratings and of favorable ratings results in identical rankings of popularity.

The second finding revealed by the comparison between usefulness and favorability is shown by the differences between frequencies of usefulness and favorability ratings shown in the last column of Table IV-2. Differences of 5 percentage points or less can be the result of sampling variation. Larger differences are significant and they are found with the last three items, namely taking antipollution devices out of cars, relaxing pollution controls for factories and letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air. These items

show a higher frequency of usefulness ratings than of favorability ratings, indicating that many people who recognize that these steps would contribute to alleviating the fuel shortage are, nevertheless, opposed to them.

TABLE IV-2

COMPARISON OF PERCEIVED USEFULNESS AND FAVORABILITY RATINGS OF ITEMS SUGGESTED TO COPE WITH FUEL SHORTAGE

	Usefulness Rating: "A Lot"/"Some" %	Favorability Rating: "For" %	Difference % Points
Driving smaller cars	71	71	0
Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	41	46	+ 5
Increasing coal production through strip mining	41	42	+ 1
Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	46	42	- 4
Taking antipollution devices out of cars	49	41	- 8
Relaxing pollution controls for factories	38	31	- 7
Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	22	12	-10

Population Area Differences

Public support for five of the seven items rated on favorablilty varies between areas of different size as shown in Table IV-3. Three items show small differences by area; seventy percent or more of the people are in favor of driving smaller cars, regardless of the size of the area where they live; the percentage in favor of taking antipollution

devices out of cars increases little between larger metropolitan areas and other areas; and letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air is something few people favor whether they live in metropolitan areas or non-metropolitan areas.

TABLE IV-3

PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE FAVORING SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS FOR COPING WITH FUEL SHORTAGE BY POPULATION AREA SIZE

	Metropolitan Areas		Non-metropolitan Areas
	1,000,000 or More	50,000-1,000,000	
	%	%	%
Driving smaller cars	72	73	70
Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	38	47	55
Increasing coal production through strip mining	33	45	53
Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	35	45	48
Taking antipollution devices out of cars	37	44	43
Relaxing pollution controls for factories	20	37	42
Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	11	10	16

Three steps find increasing support as area size decreases: relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles, letting power plants burn dirtier fuels and relaxing pollution controls for factories. Inasmuch as these are steps which would have an adverse effect on air pollution, people in non-metropolitan areas who support them seem to contradict themselves when they oppose letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air.

This apparent contradiction is explained by relating this survey to the one done last year. In many non-metropolitan areas air pollution is not a serious concern and the lower the concern about damage to the environment, the less likely people are to oppose further increases in pollution simply because they are remote. (See Tables 21 to 27 in Volume II.) Now, when the choice is stated in terms of letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air, the issue hits home and evokes almost universal opposition.

Increasing coal production through strip mining is another step that gains support as area size decreases. That support, which already falls short of a majority of the people, may be subject to wide fluctuations depending on how closely people have experienced the effects, good and bad, of strip mining, but the sample used in this study is too small to analyze this issue by geographical areas where strip mining is practiced.

Summary

In this chapter we have discussed public support for and opposition to relaxing environmental protection as a means of coping with the fuel shortage. People were asked to give their opinion about seven steps with a variety of implications for the environment, ranging from clearly favorable (driving smaller cars) to clearly unfavorable (letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air).

Public reactions to these ways of coping with the fuel shortage reveal a marked preference for reducing fuel consumption without relaxing environmental protection. For example, 71 percent of the people favor driving smaller cars and only 41 percent favor taking pollution controls out of cars.

Significantly, none of the steps associated with a relaxation of environmental protection receives the support of a majority of the American public.

A comparison of the percentages of people who are for various solutions and of the percentages who rated these solutions as being helpful in coping with the fuel crisis shows great similarities between them. Thus, the longer list of steps discussed in Chapter III can be used as a guide to people's preferences for solutions to the fuel shortage. As shown in that chapter, the majority of people prefer solutions that do not involve a relaxation of environmental protection.

INFLUENCE OF THE FUEL SHORTAGE ON ATTITUDES TOWARD ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

The data discussed in the preceding chapters show that, in spite of the fuel shortage, a majority of the American people are opposed to a relaxation of environmental protection.

In this chapter we will probe the effect of the fuel shortage further by relating people's attitudes to their ratings of the effect that shortage had on them. One might expect that people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage would be more disposed to relaxing environmental protection than people who felt less affected by the fuel shortage. As we shall see, this has not happened.

Questions Asked About the Influence of the Fuel Crisis

Personal reactions to events vary a great deal. The measure used here is a simple scaling device that makes it possible to array people by how affected they felt, personally, by the fuel shortage.

The question was asked as follows:

> "This country is experiencing a fuel shortage. Some people have been affected a great deal, others have not been affected at all by the fuel shortage. How much has the fuel shortage affected you personally? Has it affected you a lot, some but not a lot, only a little or not at all?"

We will show the answers to this question and we will relate them to information discussed in preceding chapters.

How Affected People Felt

Table V-1 shows the frequency with which each answer was given. It shows that personal reactions to the fuel shortage vary a great deal. The most frequent answers are "some but not a lot" and "only a little". The answers by residents of metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas are quite similar (Table 30 in Volume II).

TABLE V-1
HOW AFFECTED PEOPLE FELT BY THE FUEL SHORTAGE

BASE	Total Sample (496)
	%
A lot	17
Some but not a lot	33
Only a little	28
Not at all	21
No answer	1

Relationship Between Reaction to Fuel Shortage and Changes in Feelings About Fighting Pollution

In Chapter II we discussed the extent to which people perceived their feelings about fighting pollution to have changed during the last twelve months. Table V-2 relates the perception of change in feelings to the reaction to the fuel shortage.

TABLE V-2

CHANGES IN FEELINGS ABOUT FIGHTING POLLUTION
AND REACTION TO THE FUEL SHORTAGE

BASE	How Affected by the Fuel Shortage			
	A Lot (84)	Some (165)	A Little (141)	Not at All (105)
	%	%	%	%
Feelings About Fighting Pollution Compared to a Year Ago				
More in favor	19	20	19	13
Less in favor	4	1	4	4
About the same	75	78	77	82
No answer	2	1	-	1

It is readily apparent from the data in Table V-2 that people's perception of feelings about fighting pollution are not related to how affected they felt by the fuel shortage.

Influence of the Fuel Shortage on the Perceived Usefulness of Steps to Ease that Shortage

Table V-3 shows the percentage of people who rated each item describing ways of easing the fuel shortage. In this table, the people interviewed are classified by how affected they felt by the fuel shortage. The last column shows the differences between those who felt affected "a lot" or "some" and those who felt affected "a little" or "not at all".

Most of the differences between these two groups of people are small and probably due to sampling variations except for the following items:

Driving smaller cars
Cutting down the number of airplane flights
Building more atomic energy plants
Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays
Increasing coal production through strip mining
Rationing gasoline

For each of these six items the perception of their usefulness in coping with the fuel shortage is influenced by how affected people felt by the fuel shortage. The more affected people felt, the more likely they are to perceive these steps as useful.

Four of these solutions entail inconvenience or at least a departure from generally entrenched habits. The other two are: building atomic energy plants and increasing coal production through strip mining.

Public opinion about the usefulness of relaxing federal environmental quality standards and increasing the price of fuels is not influenced by how affected people felt by the fuel shortage.

TABLE V-3

FREQUENCY OF "A LOT" AND "SOME" USEFULNESS RATINGS
RELATED TO HOW AFFECTED RESPONDENT WAS BY FUEL SHORTAGE

	How Affected by Fuel Shortage		
BASE	A lot/ Some (249)	A Little/ None (246)	Difference
	%	%	% Points
Items Rated on Their Usefulness to Ease Fuel Shortage			
Improving public transportation	87	81	+ 6
Lowering speed limits on highways	78	77	+ 1
Driving smaller cars	74	66	+ 8*
Building the Alaskan pipeline	68	68	0
Keeping the temperature at home less comfortable	65	68	- 3
Cutting down the number of airplane flights	62	52	+10*
Building more atomic energy plants	58	48	+11*
Taking antipollution devices out of cars	45	51	- 6
Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	46	47	- 1
Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays	49	39	+10*
Increasing coal production through strip mining	47	35	+12*
Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	43	39	+ 4
Relaxing pollution controls for factories	41	35	+ 6
Rationing gasoline	43	32	+11*
Having daylight saving time all year round	36	35	+ 1
Removing price controls from oil and gas	32	31	+ 1
Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption	28	28	0
Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	24	20	+ 4

*Differences not due to sampling variation

Influence of the Fuel Shortage on Attitude For or Against Various Ways of Easing that Shortage

The same pattern is revealed by the figures shown in Table V-4 where the differences between the two groups are even smaller and all but one within the expected range of sampling variations. The one difference that stands out and is statistically significant is found, again, in the case of increasing coal production through strip mining.

TABLE V-4

PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE FAVORING SUGGESTED SOLUTIONS FOR COPING WITH FUEL SHORTAGE BY HOW AFFECTED THEY FELT BY IT

	How Affected by Fuel Shortage		
BASE	A Lot/ Some (249)	A Little/ None (246)	Difference
	%	%	% Points
Driving smaller cars	70	74	- 4
Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	43	48	- 5
Increasing coal production through strip mining	47	37	+10*
Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	39	44	- 5
Taking antipollution devices out of cars	37	44	- 7
Relaxing pollution controls for factories	27	26	+ 1
Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	12	13	- 1

*Difference not due to sampling variation

We conclude that people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage are also more likely to want to do something about it than people who felt less affected by the fuel shortage, but both groups are equally

opposed to relaxing federal environmental quality standards.

Summary

The extent to which people have felt affected by the fuel shortage influences their views on what to do about it, but the majority of people uniformly oppose solutions involving a relaxation of environmental quality standards.

When it comes to cutting down the number of airplane flights, build-more atomic energy plants, driving smaller cars and improving public transportation, people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage are also more likely to favor taking these steps to alleviate the fuel shortage. Support for closing gasoline stations on Sunday and rationing gasoline is at a lower level but follows the same pattern.

By contrast, when it comes to taking antipollution devices out of cars, letting power plants burn dirtier fuels, relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles, relaxing pollution controls for factories and letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air, people who felt more affected by the fuel shortage are no more likely to favor these steps than people who felt less affected by the fuel shortage.

Increasing coal production through strip mining is more likely to be favored by those more affected than by those less affected, but in neither case is a majority in favor of doing it.

Form Approved
OMB No. 158S 74005

J. M. Viladas Company, Division of
de Kadt Marketing and Research, Inc.
12 Havemeyer Place
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830

V-363
Apr.74

QUESTIONNAIRE # ____ ____ ____ ____
1 2 3 4

ENVIRONMENT STUDY

NAME: _____ TELEPHONE: _____

ADDRESS: _____ CITY: _____

INTERVIEWER: _____ DATE: _____

VALIDATED [ ] BY: _____ CLUSTER # ____ ____ ____ ____ ____
5 6 7 8 9

Hello, I'm _____ from de Kadt Marketing and Research.

1. Last June we interviewed you about your opinions concerning pollution and the environment. Compared to last Spring, are you now more in favor of fighting pollution, less in favor of fighting pollution or do you feel about the same as you did a year ago about fighting pollution?

10-

More in favor.....1
Less in favor.....2
About the same.....3

2. This country is experiencing a fuel shortage. Some people have been affected a great deal, others have not been affected at all by the fuel shortage. How much has the fuel shortage affected you personally? Has it affected you: (READ LIST AND CIRCLE ANSWER BELOW.)

11-

A lot.....4
Some but not a lot.....3
Only a little.....2
or, Not at all.....1

V-363
Apr.74

3. Now I'm going to read a list of things that have been suggested to cope with the fuel shortage. Some people think these things can help ease the shortage, others think they won't help. Now, in your opinion, would you say that ____ can help a lot, some but not a lot, only a little or not at all? (READ LIST STARTING WITH ✓ED ITEM AND CIRCLE ANSWER BELOW.)

	A Lot	Some	A Little	Not at All	Not Sure, D/K	
a. Cutting down the number of airplane flights	5	4	3	2	1	12-
b. Taking antipollution devices out of cars	5	4	3	2	1	13-
✓c. Keeping the temperature at home a little less comfortable	5	4	3	2	1	14-
d. Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage	5	4	3	2	1	15-
e. Letting the price of gasoline go up to discourage consumption	5	4	3	2	1	16-
f. Rationing gasoline	5	4	3	2	1	17-
g. Closing gasoline stations down on Sundays	5	4	3	2	1	18-
h. Driving smaller cars	5	4	3	2	1	19-
i. Lowering the speed limits on highways	5	4	3	2	1	20-
j. Increasing coal production through strip mining	5	4	3	2	1	21-
k. Building more atomic energy plants	5	4	3	2	1	22-
l. Having daylight saving time all year round	5	4	3	2	1	23-
m. Building the Alaskan pipeline	5	4	3	2	1	24-
n. Relaxing pollution controls for factories	5	4	3	2	1	25-
o. Removing price controls from oil and gas	5	4	3	2	1	26-
p. Improving public transportation	5	4	3	2	1	27-
q. Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air	5	4	4	2	1	28-
r. Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles	5	4	3	2	1	29-

4. I'm going to name a few of the things that have been suggested to help cope with the fuel shortage. For each one I name, please tell me whether you are for or against it. Are you for or against: (READ LIST STARTING WITH ✓ED ITEM AND CIRCLE ANSWER BELOW.)

	For	Against	Not Sure, No Answer	
a. Taking antipollution devices out of cars.....	1	2	3	30-
b. Letting power plants burn coal or any other fuel that is less clean than what they burned before the shortage.....	1	2	3	31-
c. Driving smaller cars.....	1	2	3	32-
✓d. Increasing coal production through strip mining....	1	2	3	33-
e. Relaxing pollution controls for factories.....	1	2	3	34-
f. Letting air pollution increase in areas that now have clean air.....	1	2	3	35-
g. Relaxing the timetable for cutting down further the pollution from automobiles.....	1	2	3	36-

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

INTERVIEWER: MAKE SURE RESPONDENT INFORMATION, INCLUDING CLUSTER #, IS PROPERLY ENTERED ON PAGE 1.